

NOW ON TELEVISION

WJZ-TV NEW YORK

WFIL-TV PHILADELPHIA

NOVEMBER 23, 1948

535th BROADCAST

Illinois U Library Town Meeting



Reg. U.S. Pat. Off.

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



Reg. U.S. Pat. Off.

Should There Be Stricter Government Control of Lobbies?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

MIKE MONRONEY

HERBERT U. NELSON

IRVING R. KAUFMAN

RALPH W. GWINN

(See also page 12)

COMING

—November 30, 1948—

Are Our Ideals Being Destroyed by the Machine Age?

—December 7, 1948—

Is a United Protestant Church Possible Now?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N.Y.

VOLUME 14, NUMBER 30



\$4.50 A YEAR: 10c A COPY



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF NOVEMBER 23:

"Should There Be Stricter Government Control of Lobbies?"

<i>Mr.</i> DENNY	3
<i>Congressman</i> MONRONEY	5
<i>Mr.</i> NELSON	6
<i>Mr.</i> KAUFMAN	8
<i>Congressman</i> GWINN	10
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	14



THE BROADCAST OF NOVEMBER 30:

"Are Our Ideals Being Destroyed by the Machine Age?"



THE BROADCAST OF DECEMBER 7:

"Is a United Protestant Church Possible Now?"



The Broadcast-Telecast of Nov. 23, 1948, originated in Town Hall, New York City, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., EST, over the American Broadcasting Co. Network.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. **Send Subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N. Y.** Subscription price, \$4.50 a year. 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

ILLINOIS LIBRARY

Town Meeting



GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR



NOVEMBER 23, 1948

VOL. 14, No. 30

Should There Be Stricter Government Control of Lobbies?

Announcer:

Yes, friends, that's your Town Crier, Johnny Griggs, inviting you to another session of "America's Town Meeting of the Air." Tonight in Kansas City there is a modern Town Crier at work using his telephone calling several of his friends, reminding them to listen. In fact, he's probably been calling his friends for the past half hour because he is an ardent Town Meeting fan who is doing his job in the interest of good citizenship to help advance an honestly informed opinion in America. Town Meeting audiences are growing every week through your efforts.

Norman Cousins, editor of *The Saturday Review of Literature*, who was on our program a few weeks ago, has just returned from a lecture tour and tells us that everywhere he went he found people who had heard him on Town Meeting and he had never had such wide mail response to a radio

appearance. So remember to keep your friends informed that Tuesday night is Town Meeting night everywhere.

Now to preside over our discussion, here is our moderator, the President of Town Hall, New York, and founder of "America's Town Meeting of the Air," Mr. George V. Denny, Jr.

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. Tonight we're going to talk about lobbies. We're a long way from the early New England town meeting days when the voters met once or twice each year to decide what to do about their common problems, where to build the next road or school, and how much each citizen should be taxed.

Today we select people to represent us in our local, State, and National town meetings which we call City Councils, State Legislatures, and the Congress of the United States of America.

Lobbying is defined by Mr. Webster as the soliciting of votes of members of the legislature to carry a particular measure. A lobbyist is defined as a person not a member who tries to influence the votes of the members of the legislative body.

When the 81st Congress convenes next January, some 1,300 lobbyists will be active in Washington again. Now is that a good thing or a bad thing for this country?

In 1946, Senator Robert LaFollette, Jr., and Congressman Mike Monroney, who is to speak to us this evening, were co-authors of a bill which, among other things, required persons or organizations engaged in influencing legislation to register and file quarterly financial statements of their contributions and expenditures.

According to the *Congressional Quarterly*, 192 organizations have reported expenditures of \$4,856,991 during the first nine months of this year—1948.

There are lobbies in Washington representing labor and management, farmers, public housing, old age pensions, co-operatives, organized medicine, civil rights, and scores of other subjects. Some of these lobbies will seek to influence the members of Congress to vote their way by sheer logic, others will use the press, radio, or other devices to influence public opinion throughout the country and in

Washington. There are still others who will engage in a type of social entertainment called "plush horse" lobbying. I hope you get the idea.

Our discussion tonight doesn't involve the right of individuals and groups to lobby because the right is guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States. But in view of the extent and nature of lobbying as it has existed in the past, the question is raised whether there should not be stricter control of lobbies.

One of our speakers thinks that administrative public officials, who seek to influence public opinion should be considered as lobbyists. Indeed, one of our speakers here tonight raised the question that anybody who writes a letter to influence a Congressman's vote might also be considered a lobbyist.

Here to speak for the affirmative of tonight's question is the co-author of the present bill, Congressman A. S. Mike Monroney, Democrat of Oklahoma, and Mr. Irving R. Kaufman, former special assistant to the Attorney General in charge of the recent lobby inquiry. Speaking for the negative will be Mr. Herbert U. Nelson, executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, and Congressman Ralph W. Gwinn, Republican from New York. May we hear first from Congressman A. S. Mike Monroney of Oklahoma. Congressman Monroney. (*Applause.*)

Congressman Monroney:

Thank you, Mr. Denny, members of Town Hall, and guests. With more than two years of experience in lobby registration behind us, I think it is now time for the Congress to take another look at the problem with a view toward strengthening the Act.

A part of the Act has worked well. Individuals who work as lobbyists have registered. This has been accomplished in spite of the hundreds who have registered protesting that any similarity between themselves and a lobbyist, living or dead, is purely coincidental.

There have been 1,375 registrations of individuals and organizations. Most of these are individuals. The law now requires all persons and organizations who are principally engaged for pay in seeking or opposing legislation to register.

You might say that Congress wants to know these four things: who they are, who employs them, how much they are being paid for the job, and how much they spent in carrying it out. But the weakness of the Act, which has been shown after two years, is that the law is likely to miss the biggest forces in the Nation today which are creating mail-order opinion for the sole purpose of influencing Congress.

You people and the Congress have a right to some protection against misrepresentation of your ideas on legislation. Sometimes

skillful lobby techniques and publicity can work strange wonders.

I have seen ex-service men ask repeal of veterans' home building priorities and even housewives demand a premature repeal of price control. Farmers who produce hundreds of pounds of cotton seed have written to me to support the oleo tax because they have one cow and businessmen who protest against discriminatory freight rates have urged Congress to grant the railroads anti-trust exemptions on these very rates.

This vast array of powerful organizations usually heads up in Washington. Directed by efficient and well-paid secretaries, they purport to represent your vast business, professional, agriculture, or labor interests. Usually they sponsor or oppose legislation which the Washington office decides is good or bad for you instead of you telling the Washington office of your desires.

So vast is this power, so complete is the domination of these Washington policy makers that both you and the Congress have the right to factual and actual information on their activities. No member of Congress wants to impinge on your right to petition the Congress as guaranteed by the Constitution, but we all should be interested in properly identifying nationwide pressures which can be originated by pressing a button in some Washington office.

As the Act now stands, it is

doubtful if many of the most important groups able to originate these outpourings of so-called public opinion can be made to file their legislative expense accounts. Such organizations as the American Association of Railroads, the National Association of Manufacturers, the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. question it. Many others either refuse or file vague and incomplete expense reports.

If these associations and organizations are exempt from filing their lobbying expenses, if only the individual or organization exclusively engaged in lobbying is under the Act, then Congress is straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel.

Congress should make clear that these organizations are included to the full extent of their legislative activities and find what actual contributions and expenditures are used for lobbying.

Congress should staff its lobby registration office so that information filed would be more readily available to the public and the press in usable form. Better reporting blanks drafted so that all questions regarding lobbying expense would have to be answered under oath is badly needed. Present forms invite evasion.

In conclusion, lobbying can serve a useful purpose in our system if properly identified and if they honestly and fully report their expenditures. But their useful function in testifying before

Congress and giving the views of those they represent does not entitle them to engage in undercover activities which provide inaccurate and distorted impressions of public opinion. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Congressman Monroney. Our next speaker is a registered lobbyist and is proud of it. He believes that lobbies perform a necessary part of our Government and are not in need of any further Government control. He's Mr. Herbert U. Nelson, executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards and a former consultant to the Defense Housing Coordinator. Mr. Nelson. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Nelson:

Ladies and gentlemen. Congressman Monroney, you said that organization secretaries sometimes lead their members around by the nose and so mislead Congress. May I say to you that as secretary of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, I am constantly being criticized by our thousand boards throughout the country for not being sufficiently firm and vigorous in telling Congress what they think.

I feel that Congress has gone a far as it should in regulating lobbying activity. Congress has recognized the lobbies as being essential to the law-making process. It has asked them to stand up and be counted freely and openly. The

must identify their spokesmen, they must tell Congress about the money they collect and spend. What more can Congress do without destroying legitimate citizen groups that speak for vital national viewpoints thus denying rights of free speech and petition for the redress of grievance?

As long as lobbies function honestly and openly and tell the truth, I feel they serve a public interest. How can the public interest be found by Congress without such discussion?

For instance, I'm supposed to be a part of the real estate lobby. I'll tell you what we've done. Sixteen years ago, we urged Congress to establish the Home Loan Bank System. They did. This will prevent another wave of wholesale foreclosures on homes.

We asked Congress for FHA. We got it. Every man who hears this discussion tonight knows that FHA has put home ownership within the reach of millions who couldn't afford it before.

When the war was over, we asked Congress to take the controls off building. It did and in three years we've turned out 2 1/2 million homes. Even the Government can't keep up with our production figures and the housing shortage will be over long before the calamity howlers quit talking about it.

If Congress does what you, Mr. Kaufman, advocate, and makes it impossible for citizen groups and

small business people to tell their story, I don't think you're going to like the results. Here's why. In France, right now, they do not have lobbies. Instead, nearly every group of citizens representing a vital interest or a grievance forms its own political party. So there are in France today 25 political parties—15 of them with representation in the Chamber of Deputies.

Imagine if you can the confusion and turmoil of such a situation. It is almost impossible to get a national decision on anything. In three years, the French Nation has had thirteen Cabinets or Governments. Many French leaders told me personally this summer that they have in fact no government at all and that their legislature has become merely a debating society.

Now this might be fun, for some, but in the fields of production, consumption, and foreign affairs, it is proving disastrous to the French people. I am sure that you, Congressmen Monroney, and you, Mr. Kaufman, do not want to see the governmental chaos in France duplicated in our country.

I think that lobbies are better than splinter parties. We've got to have one or the other in representative government. I'm sure that you, Mr. Monroney, don't want Congress to sit in an ivory tower and not listen to citizen groups at home or in Washington. If Congress, by over-regulation of

lobbies insulates itself against live contact with the citizen groups affected by legislation it cannot make just laws.

When you tinker with lobbies, you tinker with the Bill of Rights, because, remember, the spirit of the Bill of Rights is to give protection to the individual and to minorities against ill-considered action by the majority.

No doubt everyone who listens to this debate tonight is a part of some organization which is expressing its views to Congress on some vital issue. If so, you, too, are a part of a lobby. Your lobby is your watchman. Don't let Congress gag it. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Nelson. Well, Mr. Kaufman, it's your turn. Our next speaker is Mr. Irving Kaufman, New York attorney and former special assistant to the U.S. Attorney General, in charge of the Lobby Compliance Section of the Department of Justice. Mr. Kaufman. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Kaufman:

Mr. Nelson, I just can't agree with your premise. It's a naive premise: that since there is a lobbying law on the statute books, Congress and the public now know all there is to know about lobbyists. There is no such thing at all.

For my part of the discussion this evening, I would like to open by suggesting that President Truman and the Democratic Party

owe their victory on November 4 to the very lobbies that helped make the 80th Congress the most lobbied Congress in our history.

There seems to be pretty general agreement that probably the biggest single factor in the Republican defeat was the people's termination to repudiate the 80th Congress. If we can agree on that, then you must agree that the Democratic victory must be attributed in large part to the forces which made the 80th Congress what it was.

It is, therefore, not some abstract force or academic question that we are discussing this evening. We are discussing the special interest lobbies which were responsible for the deeds and misdeeds of the Congress which voters repudiated on election day (*applause*), and whether these lobbies should be subjected to stricter regulations.

I don't talk of all lobbies. I talk of these special interest lobbies.

Senator Barkley has stated, and it has not been disputed, that lobbying expenditures, in this single session of Congress, exceeded the entire sum required to run the Senate.

Attorney General Clark, under whom it was my privilege to serve as a special assistant in charge of the lobby inquiry, charged that the lobbyists constituted in effect a third Congress. More than a million dollars were spent by them

to influence legislation in this last Congress alone.

The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act is but two years old. Its objective is to turn on the cleansing spotlight of publicity to force a disclosure as to the identity of the lobbyists and the money that they spend.

Our economic well-being and even our very lives are directly affected by current legislation. The new lobbying act does not prevent any person or organization from freely contacting members of Congress. It simply requires a frank and honest disclosure of all fees paid, and all expenses incurred for lobbying. This disclosure is not for the purpose of satisfying someone's idle curiosity. It is necessary in order that Congress may better evaluate evidence and data from organized groups.

Thirty-five states already have enacted laws of this general nature recognizing the salutary effect of such regulations. The true intent and purpose of congressional legislation too often utterly fails when Congress is subjected to a barrage of powerful and greedy pressure groups, tragic indeed in these critical times.

Almost 1,500 individual lobbyists have already registered and hundreds of lobbying organizations have filed financial statements disclosing the receipt of many millions of dollars. Think of it—more lobbyists than there are members of Congress.

The 79th Congress accomplished a great necessary purpose in the enactment of this law—the first time in the 160 years of our history that anything was actually done about it. It had to be done. The lobbyists were literally crawling over Congress.

A great need for new and extremely important legislation will immediately face our new Congress. The lobbyists will be out in full force. We can do no less than make them sail under their true colors.

I have recommended to the Attorney General, for his consideration, the amending of the present act in order to bring about wider coverage, particularly in the association or group lobbying fields. It is needed, but neither the Act nor any future amendments should curtail in any degree whatsoever the right of anyone to make his ideas and wishes known to Congress. That is a basic, fundamental right that must not be impaired.

The true purpose of the Act is simply to remove forever the sinister cloak of secrecy which has surrounded the activities of lobbyists, salutary or evil, through all the years. In legislation, we must have the best and only the best unhampered by the avarice and cunning of those who work better in the dark.

It is true today, perhaps in a greater degree than ever before, that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Kaufman. Our next speaker represents a part of the people of the State of New York. He's a Republican Congressman from New York, who stands squarely with Mr. Nelson. May we hear from Congressman Ralph W. Gwinn. (*Applause.*)

Congressman Gwinn:

Mr. Denny, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Nelson just suggested that if Mr. Kaufman can explain the recent victory through the lobbyists, then he certainly ought to believe in lobbyists. No, that isn't the explanation. Let me guess.

The explanation of the last election is that the New Deal or welfare state, the Government departmental lobbies, have so completely fooled the people that the socialist state can manage our economy better than the private citizen can manage himself and his property. (*Applause.*) That's the vast lobby we face—socialism around the world.

Our own socialism, particularly in Washington, exempts itself from law, but fastens stricter and stricter controls on the citizens and their property. It calls the individual citizen groups, as we have just heard, special interest groups, pressure groups, selfish, greedy lobbyists, unfit to practice freedom. It smears them, prosecutes them, when they resist the encroachments of our own type of world state socialism.

So, under Section 307 of the Lobby Act, the individual and his associations are threatened with jail unless they report their finances and their activities to influence legislation. Then Section 308 completely exempts all government officials from the Lobby Act. Yet government administrative departments and bureaus, every one of them, from agriculture to war, constitute our most dangerous lobbies. (*Applause.*) They spent in 1947 75 million dollars and employed 45,000 publicists, news releases, script writers, radio commentators, lecturers, travelers, and movie producers, full and part time, to influence legislation. This the Budget Bureau admits.

Individual citizens and organizations spent a pitiful sum, referred to as a little over four million dollars, by comparison, in opposition to the vast power of Government itself, using unlimited money to lobby.

The Department of Agriculture spends \$9,295,000 to influence legislation and employs 525 persons to do it. From that quarter, get legislation controlling the price of grain by government purchases and subsidies. In that way, it controls the price of beef and butter and bread.

The technique varies; the War Department spends \$5,715,000. Its specialty is influencing the mind of women to influence Congress. For example, to put over Universal Military Training, it works

through every woman's organization from the Federated Women's Clubs, representing some 10 million women, down.

They didn't overlook the Girl Scouts in their teaching that Universal Military Training is a fine thing for the youth. It may be, but do we want the War Department to tell us what is right?

OPA has been the most vicious of all lobbies, fooling the people into thinking that Government can force one group to produce and another group to get beef and butter and bread below cost. It admits spending \$2,571,000 a year to put this over on the people.

The Federal Security Agency of the Government is now tuning up its national machine to get legislation to socialize health and medicine and education. It spent, in 1946, over two million for that purpose. This lobby proposes to bribe 750,000 doctors, nurses, and hospital personnel and a million school teachers to come over into state socialist management of their economy. That means votes. Even the Tennessee Valley spent \$245,000 to keep its show going.

In conclusion, ladies and gentlemen, we believe that Communists and Socialists are at vital posts in disseminating government lobby propaganda and controlling our minds. We want to know about them. We should stop them.

We should vote to repeal that part of the Lobby Act which exempts the Government lobby. We

need to tighten it against the freedom of the citizen. We must stop the teaching and spread of socialism by government lobbies, at taxpayers' expense, in the United States of America. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Congressman Gwinn. Well, we've certainly had both sides of this question, and now that we have representatives of both sides, gentlemen, will you come up here around the microphone and let's have a little discussion before we take the questions from the audience. Congressman Monroney, we haven't heard from you for awhile, so it's your chance now.

Congressman Monroney: I'd like to ask Congressman Gwinn about this government lobby. Since the Congress appropriates all the funds and directs the purpose for which they are used, since the Act exempts only public officials acting in their official capacity, and since Congress is the director of their official capacity, and since there is already a criminal statute on the books against using federal funds for lobbying, I would like to ask Congressman Gwinn what further legislation he would like to include to do the thing he asked to do?

Congressman Gwinn: My colleague, Mr. Monroney knows that in our system of government now the government lobbyists and the

Administration are one and the same thing and the Congress belongs to the same party, and the Attorney General belongs to the same party. We can't get anybody to prosecute him. (*Applause.*)

Congressman Monroney: I seem to remember rather distinctly that the Republican Party was in control of the Congress for the last few years. (*Applause.*)

Congressman Gwinn: The Republican Congress had a President and the lobbies to contend with (*laughter*) and the people, who were thoroughly committed to the proposition of supporting the government lobbies' contention of what government should do. Now

we did what the people, thought, wanted.

Mr. Denny: All right, thank you. Mr. Kaufman?

Mr. Kaufman: Mr. Congressman, I remember being in the Department of Justice for about a year on this lobby inquiry and don't ever recall you ever making a single complaint of a violation under this section. This cry about government lobby, to me is just a strawman that you have set up. It's a diversionary tactic to take the spotlight off of special, self-interest lobbies. We've seen that throughout the last campaign.

Now, might I also suggest that the Department of Justice has

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

RALPH WALDO GWINN — Congressman Gwinn, a lawyer and writer, has been a Republican Representative to Congress from New York since 1945. Born in Noblesville, Indiana, in 1884, he attended DePauw University from 1901 to 1905 and received an LL.B. from Columbia in 1908. Since then he has engaged in a practice of law in New York City. During the first World War Congressman Gwinn served as a special counsel of the War Shipping Board and as special representative of the Secretary of War in the European Theatre. He has been village counsel of Bronxville, N.Y. and a member of the Board of Education.

Active in religious affairs, Congressman Gwinn is a trustee of the International Council of Religious Education and the Agricultural Missions Foundations. He is also chairman of the Laymen's Movement for a Christian World, Inc. He is the author of articles on religion, agriculture, and business.

ALMER STILLWELL MIKE MONRONEY — Born in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, in 1902, Congressman Mike Monroney, is a graduate of the University of Oklahoma. From 1924 to 1928, he was a reporter and political writer for the *Oklahoma News*. A member of the Democratic party, he has been Representative to

United States Congress from the 5th Oklahoma District since 1939. With Robert LaFollette, he is co-author of the Reorganization Act which includes the lobby registration provision.

HERBERT UNDEEN NELSON — Executive vice-president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards since 1922, Mr. Nelson has also been a consultant to the Defense Housing Coordinator.

Mr. Nelson was born in Ellsworth, Wisconsin, in 1886. He is a graduate of the University of Minnesota. From 1913 to 1916, he was secretary of the Juvenile Protective Association of Hennepin County, Minnesota. From 1917 to 1921, he was secretary of the Minneapolis Real Estate Board. He was also secretary of the Minneapolis Planning Commission, and has been active in other groups concerned with real estate and housing.

Mr. Nelson has written several books and has contributed to real estate journals.

IRVING R. KAUFMAN — Mr. Kaufman, an attorney, is a former special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States in charge of the Lobby Regulations Section of the Department of Justice.

think, the greatest investigative staff in the world under Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. (*Applause.*) I am sure, that if you had ever made a complaint to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, that complaint would have been fully investigated, too. Or do you suggest that he was also a Democrat? (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Denny: I think we're going to let Mr. Nelson get in on this now.

Mr. Nelson: Mr. Kaufman you spoke of sinister, secret lobbies. I'd like to know more about that —know who they are and what the Department of Justice has been doing about uncovering these secret lobbies.

Mr. Kaufman: I would like to know something about them myself and that's why I said we need broader legislation. We need a broader base, because I remember very well, Mr. Nelson, that although the Moderator said that you were proud to register as a lobbyist, it took us almost a year and a half to convince you that you were covered under the statute. (*Laughter.*) Therefore, I suggest, Mr. Nelson, that we need more legislation to remove the doubt that existed in your mind and in the minds of a lot of other associations. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Nelson: Mr. Kaufman when I inquired from the Department of Justice whether I was supposed to register or not, and how, I couldn't get any response. They

didn't understand and they hadn't heard of the law. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Gwinn, have you any questions here at this point?

Congressman Gwinn: I'd like to ask my colleague, Mr. Monroney, what there is about Congressmen's virtues that are so corrupted that everybody who wants to talk to a Congressman must register and make public notice of the fact that they are going to do so.

Congressman Monroney: I would answer my distinguished colleague, Representative Gwinn, with the fact that it's not necessary to register to talk to your Congressman, but if you go out and spend several thousand dollars or a half million dollars in creating a lot of so-called public opinion to impress your Congressman with pressure, then we think it should be public information and available to the Congress and to the public, too. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, very much, gentlemen. Now, while we get ready for our question period, I'm sure that you, our listeners, will be interested in the following message.

Announcer: You are listening to the 535th broadcast of America's Town Meeting originating tonight in Town Hall, New York.

For your convenience, Town Hall prints each week a complete text of each Town Meeting, including the questions and answers

to follow in the Town Meeting Bulletin. Copies of tonight's program, as well as past and future programs, may be secured by writing to Town Hall, New York 18, N. Y., enclosing 10c to cover the cost of printing and mailing. You should allow at least two weeks for delivery.

If you would like to subscribe to the Bulletin for six months, enclose \$2.35, or for a year send \$4.50. Or, if you would like a trial subscription, enclose \$1.00 for eleven issues.

At the same time this program is being broadcast, hundreds of local town meetings are assembled across the nation in homes, in churches, in schools. The town meeting idea has met with great success, too, in the work of prominent organizations.

For example, the local community councils affiliated with the National Council for Community Improvement employ the town meeting plan to aid in the solution of the many and complex problems which confront every city. On January 11th, the National Council for Community Improvement will hold a regional conference in Boston and, here, again, the format of free and open discussion will be used to coordinate the efforts of the participating organizations.

Are you using the town meeting idea in your community? We will be happy to provide you with helpful suggestions if you write to us at Town Hall, New York 18, New York.

Now for our question period, we return you to Mr. Denny.

QUESTION, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: For our question period tonight we are glad to let you all know that this is Town Hall Club night on Town Meeting, and more than 200 members of the Town Hall Club, the part of this institution that we call Town Hall, are here to ask questions. I hope we can take a lot of questions from the representatives of the Town Hall Club tonight, and from the representatives of other parts of the country who are here in this audience of 1,500 people. I'm going to start with the young

man from the back of the Hall, there. The gentleman with the gray coat.

Man: My question is for Mr. Kaufman. Doesn't the American system of lobbies help to alleviate the fact that millions of American voters have never once written a letter of opinion to their Congressmen?

Mr. Kaufman: I have not stated here tonight that all lobbies are bad. I thought I made it perfectly clear that some serve a useful purpose. But I say that there has been

enough established, to date, to indicate that lobbies should be regulated because some of them have overstepped their bounds.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman over on the other side of the Hall.

Man: I'd like to direct my question to Congressman Monroney. Isn't the word "principally" that is used in the Act an out for those men who declare that lobbying is not their *principal* function?

Congressman Monroney: You are exactly right, sir. That is one of the difficulties that we face. We think that anything that is a substantial part of the activities of a great organization—such as with the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce—perhaps 80 per cent of their job might be in not interfering or influencing legislation, but that 20 per cent, because of their size and power, might be a very substantial thing in affecting legislation.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Congressman Monroney. Mr. Kaufman has a comment on that.

Mr. Kaufman: I just want to add a word to that, if I may. You're quite right in that suggestion, because that has been the very thing that has plagued the Department of Justice in attempting to enforce this Act. I might say that each one of the large associations and organizations have attempted to hide behind the word "principal"—the use of the word "principal." The

Department of Justice, of course, has placed a construction upon that word. In my recommendation to the Attorney General I recommended that that word be eliminated from the Act completely.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman on the second row here.

Man: I have a question for Congressman Ralph Gwinn. From a consumer's point of view, what good are lobbies and do lobbies actually influence Congress?

Congressman Gwinn: Well, I'll give you a good example of the biggest lobby of all that has spent a million dollars in the last Congress, namely, the labor lobby. It didn't influence Congress; we passed the law over the President's veto.

Now the lobbies that present the facts on taxation for example, on price control, do influence beneficially the consumer, because they reduce taxes, present to the Congress why taxes should be reduced so that more money can be left with the folks to manage for themselves, instead of being spent by Congress. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Congressman Monroney, I was wondering if you were going to let that pass.

Congressman Moroney: I noticed the large number of people that were engaged in trying to help reduce taxes—I just wondered what kind of a lobby we had in trying to keep the Nation financially sound to face its greatest se-

curity threat that we've faced since the beginning of World War II. *(Applause.)*

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady with the red sweater over there on the other side. That's right. Yes, I mean you. Or is that a red blouse? I'm sorry.

Lady: I'd like to ask Mr. Nelson a question. The term "lobby" or "lobbyist" has come to have an unfavorable connotation. Couldn't something be done to correct this misconception of the meaning?

Mr. Nelson: Well, I feel that the term "lobbyist" is gaining respectability daily because it seems to me that most of the best people belong to some lobby or other. *(Laughter.)*

Man: May I ask a question of Congressman Monroney. I would like to know, Congressman, why our Government allows certain people to lobby for certain things that are not beneficial to the public in general?

Congressman Monroney: Well, who's going to decide which things are beneficial to the public in general. *(Laughter.)*

Mr. Denny: Would the gentleman like to answer that question?

Man: Well, no. *(Laughter.)*

Mr. Denny: I guess you answered that satisfactorily. I see a lady back there with a beautiful chartreuse blouse on, will she come down? Go ahead.

Lady: Congressman Gwinn, don't you think that the lobbyists contribute to the high prices as, for

instance, in the case of oleomargarine tax?

Congressman Gwinn: The oleomargarine tax does contribute to the high price of butter, I suppose, but lobbyists don't do that, unless you call the Government a lobby, responsible for the fixing of prices.

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you. Mr. Kaufman has a comment on that.

Mr. Kaufman: I want to say a word about that so-called government lobby. It appears to me that Congressman Gwinn is very vocal in protecting the constitutional rights of everybody to petition Congress, but when it comes to a government representative, he wants to cut it right off.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Gwinn, do you have a comment? All right.

Congressman Gwinn: I have always regarded my election to Congress as representing the people to be against the government lobbies who are trying to manage our economy and to take away from the people free management of their own economy. So I am that part of balance in Congress; I am the balance against the power of the Administration as a Congressman. *(Applause.)*

Mr. Denny: All right. You've got Mr. Kaufman and Mr. Nelson both up. We'll take them both. Yes?

Mr. Kaufman: Congressman, I take it what you object to is what you call a so-called TVA lobby

and a so-called lobby by the housing authority people, and it appears to me that whenever anybody appears to represent the public, speaks for the people in opposition to the so-called private interests lobbies, you castigate them profusely. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Kaufman. Now, Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Nelson: Mr. Kaufman, I feel that the assumption that only the government officials speak for the public is entirely mistaken. The public is made up of all sorts of groups of people. I know, I know that the government officials go into the field and spend millions of dollars on the radio and in the newspapers and with every kind of propaganda that they can think of to propagandize the public mind to put over legislation they want to create jobs for government job holders. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: All right, Mr. Gwinn?

Congressman Gwinn: I was brought up in the absolute faith that a free economy of free men serving each other can build better houses and more and get more food and better at cheaper price than government management. (*Applause.*) It is a pure question of whether you think socialism will serve the people better in terms of houses and food or whether you think a free economy will serve them better. I'm for free economy and against govern-

ment management. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Kaufman, come ahead.

Mr. Kaufman: Mr. Congressman, I was also brought up under a system that believed that free enterprise should be given a first crack at something, and then, when it failed to do the job, let the government try and do the job if it can. (*Confusion and shouts.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Gwinn, let's toss this around until we finish it.

Congressman Gwinn: I'd like for Mr. Kaufman to tell me where our free economy is. The government today manages 70 per cent of the financing of our houses. It has rent control upon us. They have forced the individual out of the building investing business. Where is our free economy? We haven't given it a chance.

Mr. Denny: Yes, Congressman Monroney?

Congressman Monroney: I think we are all getting a little confused. I just thought that Mr. Nelson in his early speech, took credit for the FHA legislation, and now his opponent is saying that that is socialized credit. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you. Now let's get on to another question. Here's a gentleman down in the fifth row. Yes?

Man: I have a question for Mr. Kaufman. Speaking for the interests of veterans, we would like to know how the Department of Justice guaranteed to help the veterans who are lobbying for

their better homes, high prices, rent controls, when they are being condemned and, as someone said, being called all kinds of names, put into a bloc form, the fact that if you don't have white on you are red, or if you have on red, you're green. How will the Government answer also to this new control of lobbying being called names?

Mr. Denny: All right, Mr. Kaufman. What about the veterans lobby for better homes?

Mr. Kaufman: I think the veterans' lobby for better homes is a very good lobby. The only point that we make is that if you have a lobbying law you can't stop and distinguish. There must be compliance, so that the members of Congress and the public—that's the purpose of the law—are in a position to distinguish. They can see how much is being spent, whether or not it is a spontaneous campaign or whether or not it is a planned campaign; whether it is pressure, or whether it is informative—that's the only purpose of the Act.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Nelson has a comment on that.

Mr. Nelson: Mr. Kaufman, I think the law now provides all these things that you're talking about, and that what you have in your mind is new legislation that will make it impossible for citizen groups to express themselves to Congress. You want thought control by government officials.

Mr. Kaufman: Mr. Nelson, I don't think the law now provides that, and, as I said before, it took us a year and a half to convince the real estate lobby that the law applied to it. I now read from a circular which your lobby got out in which you boast that you stopped the imposition of ceiling prices on all existing houses; that you stopped the imposition of ceiling prices on all vacant lots; that you stopped the Wagner-El-lender-Taft bill; that you stopped consolidation plans for all housing agencies; you got rid of Housing Expeditor Wilson Wyatt.

With all of this you still didn't know whether you were a lobby, and required to register under the Act. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman on the aisle there.

Man: To Mr. Gwinn. In the increasing of the amount of controls, how is it possible to stop with so-called special interests rather than continuing on step-by-step to all groups both local, regional, and national?

Congressman Gwinn: It's the same old story. If you've got a few bad people in the community, then make that an excuse to cover the whole category; bring them all in. That's not right. If we've got a few bad ones, why can't Congress take and handle them themselves? Let the good ones go along without government spying and regulation and control.

Mr. Denny: All right, thanks

you. The young man over there.

Man: My question is to Mr. Nelson. Is it true that some lobbies bribe the bills which they favor, into law?

Mr. Denny: Is it true that some lobbies bribe their bills into favor of Congressmen, is that what you said? (Laughter.)

Man: Something like that. (Laughter.)

Mr. Nelson: Well, I've never heard of such a thing in the time that I've been in Washington but I'd like to have the members of Congress themselves who ought to know, answer that question whether Congressmen accept bribes. (Applause and laughter.)

Mr. Denny: Congressman Monroney is coming up to bat.

Congressman Monroney: I think in most of the history of the Congress since the Civil War days, there have been few exceptions of any members being charged or convicted of accepting bribes. The influence of lobbying has changed from the old days when at some saloon a member was allowed to win a big hand at poker so the more and more and more difficult ways to catch them when the influence over the power through various organizations and other pressure groups may do about the 455 members of Congress and the 96 Senators. It is the misleading impression of public opinion that is extremely dangerous in nothing way. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now this gentleman over here.

Man: To Congressman Monroney. How may the Government further the restrictions imposed upon the operations of these power lobbies?

Congressman Monroney: Well, I think power lobbies would come under the same terms as any other lobbies. I believe that when we start trying to pick out one for a whipping-boy and ignoring the rest we are going to get into a lopsided treatment. I think the danger of lobbies dominating the Congress, and misinterpreting to the Congress public opinion, can be in any field. For that reason whether power lobby, or the housing lobby, or the labor lobby, or the railroad lobby, or any engaged, Congress says we have a right to the information of how much is spent in trying to promote the passage of that bill.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Gwinn, yes, sir?

Congressman Gwinn: In that connection, it's interesting to note that the biggest power lobbies in Washington today are the co-operative farmers' rural electrification lobbies and they're not coming up to Washington in their overalls to corrupt the Congress. I wouldn't think they would do that. Then why put the power lobby as though it were an old-fashioned corrupting outfit? It's the farmers' lobby today that has come into power.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Down in the aisle, there.

Man: Mr. Kaufman. How would you distinguish between a special interest lobby and a good lobby? Is a good lobby the one with which the Administration or the Government Administrator happens to agree? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Kaufman: I say that if you amend the act, as suggested by us, it isn't necessary to make any distinction. They all are registered.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The young lady in the blue dress there, over on this aisle.

Lady: Mr. Nelson. Is it not of value for a legislator to know who is really pressuring him and how much is being spent to influence him?

Mr. Denny: Is it of value for a legislator to know who is pressuring him and how much is being spent to influence him?

Mr. Nelson: Yes, I think so, and I agree that the present law is a fair law and that Congress should know who the organized groups are and what they are collecting and spending.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman way over there on the other side. Will you come a little closer, please? You're right under the light.

Man: Congressman Monroney, who would you say has spent the most money in the last two years—the management, farm, or labor lobbies?

Congressman Monroney: I think labor has probably reported larger amount of expenditures. I recall, A. F. of L. reported about \$875,000 for the last six months of last year, in fighting, through newspaper publicity, the Taft-Hartley Bill. I believe that exceeds the reported amount that individual management spent, but if you roll all of the expenditures by various management groups together, you would probably have a figure that would far exceed the reported by A. F. of L. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The young lady in the aisle over there under the balcony.

Lady: Congressman Gwin. Please name the specific lobbies registered in Washington which you stated before were social lobbies?

Congressman Gwinn: I think the best answer to that is that President Truman said that he would need 25 million dollars in order to drive the Socialists and the Communists out of the government departments. Congress voted him that twenty-five million. I think it's fair to assume that they occupy various strategic posts in the government lobbies that have to do with thought control of the people and influence on Congress. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady on the second row here.

Lady: Mr. Kaufman. Isn't government control over lobbies

soring peoples' right to speak to the legislative organs?

Mr. Kaufman: Not at all and it isn't control. That word is wrong. It's regulation. (Laughter.) It merely requires that they file a statement of what they receive and expend. Today many large corporations are required to file statements with the Securities and Exchange Commission. They open up all their records. They're subject to inspection. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you. This gentleman right down here.

Man: My question is addressed to Mr. Nelson. Mr. Nelson, do you believe that all lobbyists have reported to Congress the entire amounts which they have spent to influence legislation?

Mr. Nelson: I think that's a question that the Department of Justice or Mr. Kaufman should answer. (Laughter.)

Mr. Denny: That isn't quite a fair question at all, Mr. Kaufman. Let's not try to answer that. I'm sorry. No, that's not fair.

I'm afraid there isn't time for more questions because I want to give you plenty of time in your summaries.

While our speakers prepare their summaries of tonight's question, here's a special message of interest to you.

Announcer: A favorite question asked by Town Meeting listeners is they consider the many problems before us in a democracy is

"But what can I do?" Mr. Denny has prepared a brief twelve-point answer to this question in a small, pocket-sized pamphlet called *What Can You Do?*

There have been so many demands for this pamphlet that a second edition has just been printed. You may secure your copy by mailing 10c to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, asking for the pamphlet by Mr. Denny entitled, *What Can You Do?* It tells you how you can be an active citizen, how you can play your part in making this democracy of ours work and you can read it in less than ten minutes.

Now for the summaries of tonight's discussion, here is Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: And here is Congressman Gwinn for the first summary. Mr. Gwinn.

Congressman Gwinn: Mr. Denny, the question tonight is "Should There Be Stricter Government Control of Lobbies?" I submit there has not been a single case presented here, not a single case of bribery or undue influence, an admission that we need facts and reasons from the citizens affecting legislation. The act should stand as it is *except* that part exempting the government officials who are themselves the biggest lobbyists of all should be repealed. The Government, which is the vast expeditor of tax money, should be subject to the same rules and laws

as the private individual. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Gwinn. Now Mr. Kaufman.

Mr. Kaufman: The Congressman talks about repealing that portion of the law which exempts the government official. I ask him why, in the 80th Congress, when his party was in control, did he not submit such a piece of legislation, or was it because he had hoped that in the next Congress he would find that the Republican party was also in control of the executive branch and perhaps they would go along in his line of thinking. I say this: wholesome influences will welcome public scrutiny. Bad ones will be exposed for what they are. We need a strict lobbying law. There can be no choice. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now, Mr. Herbert Nelson.

Mr. Nelson: Well, Mr. Denny, I feel that the great occupational, economic, and cultural groups in this country—the laborer, the farmer, businessman, and so on—have to be heard through lobbies. They cannot find adequate expression through Congressional representation based solely on geography. In the interest of fairly hearing every citizen's viewpoint in Congress, let's not destroy the lobbies by over-regulation and regulation is not control. (*Applause.*)

I believe that reasonable freedom for the lobbies, under law, is necessary if we are to have a

fair Town Meeting of the Nation in Washington. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Nelson. Now a final word from Congressman Mike Monroney.

Congressman Monroney: The proposals for strengthening the Lobby Registration Act are strict in the interest of keeping Congress and the public accurately informed on the expenditures made both by individuals and organizations on their legislative activities. We simply ask that this information be complete and accurate, instead of inaccurate. Congress itself through appropriations and the legislation governing appropriations and through the permanent committees governing these government agencies now have the power and have always had the power, to regulate any lobbying government departments. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Congressman Monroney, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Kaufman, and Congressman Ralph Gwinn for giving us effectively the benefit of your opinions on both sides of tonight's question. Now before we announce next week's topic, let me remind you that you may secure a copy of tonight's program, tonight's Town Meeting Bulletin, by enclosing 10 cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing and writing to Town Hall, New York 18, New York.

Next week, December 30, we will discuss the question "Are C

Ideals Being Destroyed by the Machine Age?" Our speakers will be William L. Batt, president of SKF Industries; Dr. Clark G. Kuebler, president of Ripon College in Ripon, Wisconsin; and Dr. John Haynes Holmes, pastor of Community Church of New York; and Leonard J. Fletcher, director of training and community relations for the Caterpillar Tractor Company.

The following week, December 7, our subject will be "Is a United Protestant Church Possible Now?"

Our speakers will be the Honorable Luther V. Youngdahl, Governor of Minnesota; Dr. E. Stanley Jones, missionary in India; Dr. Truman E. Douglass, executive vice president of the Board of Home Missions of the Congregational Christian Churches; and Dr. Walter A. Maier, radio preacher for the Missouri Lutheran Church in St. Louis.

So plan now to be with us next Tuesday and every Tuesday at the sound of the crier's bell. (*Applause.*)

Concerning Town Hall

WHEN NEXT YOU COME TO NEW YORK
VISIT FAMOUS TOWN HALL



This internationally-known sign hangs in front of one of the landmarks of New York—a handsome Georgian-style building designed by the great architectural firm of McKim, Mead and White. Half a block from Times Square, heart of the theatre district, Town Hall is within walking distance of most leading hotels and shops. All subways are near and taxi-drivers need only to be told, "Town Hall!"

 AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING—now regularly on Television (as well as Radio)—originates from Town Hall on Tuesday nights throughout the winter season. (During the sunny half of the year, as many of you know, it travels the length and breadth of the United States.) Tickets to Broadcast-Telecasts are free. Stop in or, better still, write in advance.

 MUSIC—More musical events are held annually in Town Hall than in any other concert hall in the world. Such musical greats as Lotte Lehmann, Yehudi and Hepzibah Menuhin, Marian Anderson, Aksel Schiotz and Nelson Eddy have made their American recital debuts here. When planning a trip to New York write for the monthly Calendar of Events.

 LECTURES—Town Hall's world-famous Morning Lectures, now in their 55th season, run from November through April. Leaders of thought and opinion are heard Mondays, Wednesdays and Saturdays at 11. Although sold by subscription months in advance, a few single admissions are almost always available.

FOR INFORMATION IN CONNECTION WITH YOUR VISIT TO NEW YORK, WRITE: PUBLIC RELATIONS DIRECTOR, TOWN HALL, NEW YORK 18, N.Y. LUXemburg 2-2424.